

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 are pending in the Application.

Independent claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 17, 18 and 19 have been amended to make more clear the subject matter of the claims. No new matter is believed to be added, and support is found in the specification for the amendments (see, e.g. page 10 of the specification.)

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Stockwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,942.) Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's availability for Interview on August 10, 2005. In that telephonic interview, Examiner Martin and the undersigned, Applicant's attorney, discussed the applicability of Stockwell U.S. Patent 6,072,942 (herein referred to as "Stockwell") to claims 1-19.

As Applicant noted at the Interview, Stockwell appears to use an EDO to transfer any results from one filter to another, or to a terminal. Stockwell's EDO contains, along with any results of filters and/or other data, the actual code itself. (Col. 6, lines 8 to 10.) It is believed that such transmission of the actual code, along with any of the material attached by the filters, etc. in Stockwell, is more unwieldy and resource and time consuming than the indicator(s) of the amended independent claims.

Applicant did not and does not agree that Stockwell was art that anticipated (or rendered obvious) the claims before the Office. However, in an effort solely to expedite prosecution, and not as any admission or declaration that Stockwell anticipates or renders obvious the present claims, Applicant suggested in the Interview that the independent claims in the case could be amended to provide a Markush-type format with regard to

actions that might constitute "indicating." No specific group was suggested by Applicant, however, Applicant suggested that he provide one with this response.

As this response was being prepared, however, and upon further review, Applicant has decided that the Markush type group claim would be more unwieldy than the amendment that has been submitted here. Accordingly, the independent claims have been amended to make more clear that indicating, via said proscribed code scanner, whether said code contains proscribed code does not include transmitting said code to said transfer component. This limitation is of course, patentably distinct over Stockwell, which as noted above and at the Interview, transmits code in its FDO during operation.


Accordingly, it is submitted that the limitations of independent claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 17, 18 and 19, and the claims that depend from them, are not met by the Stockwell reference, and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejections be withdrawn and the claims proceed to issue.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 1-19 define patentable subject matter over the art of record and are not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the references of record.

Therefore, for the reasons given above, Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph E. Chovanes  
Registration No. 33,481  
Suite 329  
5 Great Valley Parkway  
Malvern, PA 19355  
(610) 648-3994

Dated: August 10, 2005